101ST CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
101-11

REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

100TH CONGRESS

FIRST AND SECOND SESSIONS

APRIL 4 (legislative day, JANUARY 3), 1989.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

95-994

WASHINGTON : 1989

5203-1

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(101st Congress, 1st Session)

SAM NUNN, Georgia, *Chairman*

J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
JOHN GLENN, Ohio
ALBERT GORE, Jr., Tennessee
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, Colorado
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
PETE WILSON, California
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming
SLADE GORTON, Washington
TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
DAN COATS, Indiana

ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director*
PATRICK A. TUCKER, *Staff Director for the Minority*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(100th Congress, 1st Session)

SAM NUNN, Georgia, *Chairman*

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
JOHN GLENN, Ohio
ALBERT GORE, Jr., Tennessee
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, Colorado
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
PETE WILSON, California
PHIL GRAMM, Texas
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director*
CARL M. SMITH, *Staff Director for the Minority*

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(100th Congress, 2d Session)

SAM NUNN, Georgia, *Chairman*

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi
J. JAMES EXON, Nebraska
CARL LEVIN, Michigan
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
ALAN J. DIXON, Illinois
JOHN GLENN, Ohio
ALBERT GORE, Jr., Tennessee
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, Colorado
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama

JOHN W. WARNER, Virginia
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, New Hampshire
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
DAN QUAYLE, Indiana
PETE WILSON, California
PHIL GRAMM, Texas
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona

ARNOLD L. PUNARO, *Staff Director*
CARL M. SMITH, *Staff Director for the Minority*

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, April 4, 1989.

Hon. DAN QUAYLE,
President of the Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Senate Rule XXVI.8(b) requires the submission by March 31 of this year of a report on the activities of the committee for the previous Congress.

In accordance with the requirements, I am submitting the report of the activities of the Senate Committee on Armed Services during the 100th Congress. This report outlines the most noteworthy legislative and other achievements of our Committee.

Sincerely,

SAM NUNN, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	III
Jurisdiction	1
Membership of the committee	2
Subcommittee appointments	3
Relationship of annual authorization to Department of Defense appropriations	4
Activities of the Armed Services Committee during the 100th Congress (1987 and 1988):	
Subcommittee reorganization	7
National Security Strategy hearings	8
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989	8
Two-year defense budgeting	10
Review of the INF Treaty	10
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989	11
Drug interdiction	12
Oversight of Energy Department Defense Activities	13
Base Closure and Realignment Act	14
Allegations of procurement fraud	14
Other oversight hearings	15
Reduced micro-management of Defense activities	15
Improvements to the committee's administration	16
Exhibit A	17
Exhibit B	21
Hearing on:	
Nominations referred to the committee	22
Nominations for promotions in the Armed Forces	24
Investigations, hearings, and other matters not directly pertaining to legislation before the committee	25
Committee staff	35
Rules of procedure	37
Publications:	
Hearings	41
Nominations	43
Reports	44
Executive reports	44
Committee prints	45
Information regarding appointment of Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies	46

JURISDICTION

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, approved Aug. 2, 1946, amended by Public Law 91-510 approved Oct. 26, 1970) in Part I created the standing committees of the Senate and provided that the Committee on Armed Services should consist of 13 Senators; amended by S. Res. 18 of the 82d Congress (1953) to consist of 15 Senators; amended by S. Res. 24 of the 86th Congress (1959) to consist of 17 Senators; amended by S. Res. 11 of the 90th Congress (1967) to consist of 18 Senators; amended by P.L. 91-510 (1970) to consist of 15 Senators; amended by S. Res. 15, of the 92d Congress to consist of 16 Senators; amended by S. Res. 10 of the 93d Congress (1973) to consist of 15 Senators; amended by S. Res. 17 of the 94th Congress (1975) to consist of 16 Senators; further amended by S. Res. 4, and subsequently by S. Res. 82, 95th Congress (1977) to consist of 18 Senators; and further amended by S. Res. 14, 100th Congress (1987) to consist of 20 Senators, and that to said committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials and other matters relating to the following subjects (Rule XXV(c) (1) and (2) of the Standing Rules of the Senate):

(1)1. Aeronautical and space activities peculiar to or primarily associated with the development of weapons systems or military operations.

2. Common defense.

3. Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, generally.

4. Maintenance and operation of the Panama Canal, including administration, sanitation, and government of the Canal Zone.

5. Military research and development.

6. National security aspects of nuclear energy.

7. Naval petroleum reserves, except those in Alaska.

8. Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces, including overseas education of civilian and military dependents.

9. Selective service system.

10. Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

(2) Such committee shall also study and review, on a comprehensive basis, matters relating to the common defense policy of the United States, and report thereon from time to time.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

100TH CONGRESS

SAM NUNN, Georgia, *Chairman*
*January 4, 1973**

JOHN C. STENNIS, MISSISSIPPI
*January 15, 1951**
J. JAMES EXON, NEBRASKA
*January 23, 1979**
CARL LEVIN, MICHIGAN
*January 23, 1979**
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASSACHUSETTS
*January 3, 1983**
JEFF BINGAMAN, NEW MEXICO
*January 3, 1983**
ALAN J. DIXON, ILLINOIS
*February 9, 1984**
JOHN GLENN, OHIO
*February 21, 1985**
ALBERT GORE, JR., TENNESSEE
*January 6, 1987**
TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, COLORADO
*January 6, 1987**
RICHARD C. SHELBY, ALABAMA
*January 6, 1987**

JOHN W. WARNER, VIRGINIA
*January 23, 1979**
STROM THURMOND, SOUTH CAROLINA
*January 14, 1959**
GORDON J. HUMPHREY, NEW HAMPSHIRE
*January 23, 1979**
WILLIAM S. COHEN, MAINE
*January 23, 1979**
DAN QUAYLE, INDIANA
*January 5, 1981**
PETE WILSON, CALIFORNIA
*January 3, 1983**
PHIL GRAMM, TEXAS
*February 21, 1985**
STEVEN D. SYMMS, IDAHO
*January 6, 1987**
JOHN McCAIN, ARIZONA
*January 6, 1987**

---

* Date of appointment to Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Senate Committees on Military Affairs, on the Militia, and Naval Affairs were established on December 10, 1816. The Committee on the Militia was merged with the Committee on Military Afairs in 1858 to form the Military Affairs and Militia Committee. However, in 1872 the Committee dropped "Militia" from its name. The Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees existed until 1947 when they were combined by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 into a new standing committee, the current Armed Services Committee.

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Democratic Members	*Republican Members*
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence	
SENATOR EXON, *Chairman*	SENATOR THURMOND, *Ranking*
SENATOR STENNIS	SENATOR HUMPHREY
SENATOR LEVIN	SENATOR COHEN
SENATOR KENNEDY	SENATOR QUAYLE
SENATOR BINGAMAN	SENATOR WILSON
SENATOR GLENN	
Subcommittee on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense	
SENATOR LEVIN, *Chairman*	SENATOR QUAYLE, *Ranking*
SENATOR DIXON	SENATOR THURMOND
SENATOR GLENN	SENATOR COHEN
SENATOR GORE	SENATOR WILSON
SENATOR WIRTH	SENATOR GRAMM
SENATOR SHELBY	
Subcommittee on Projection Forces and Regional Defense	
SENATOR KENNEDY, *Chairman*	SENATOR COHEN, *Ranking*
SENATOR STENNIS	SENATOR HUMPHREY
SENATOR EXON	SENATOR SYMMS
SENATOR GORE	SENATOR MCCAIN
SENATOR SHELBY	
Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology	
SENATOR BINGAMAN, *Chairman*	SENATOR GRAMM, *Ranking*
SENATOR GORE	SENATOR QUAYLE
SENATOR DIXON	SENATOR SYMMS
SENATOR WIRTH	
Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability and Support	
SENATOR DIXON, *Chairman*	SENATOR HUMPHREY, *Ranking*
SENATOR STENNIS	SENATOR THURMOND
SENATOR LEVIN	SENATOR GRAMM
SENATOR BINGAMAN	SENATOR MCCAIN
SENATOR WIRTH	
Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel	
SENATOR GLENN, *Chairman*	SENATOR WILSON, *Ranking*
SENATOR EXON	SENATOR SYMMS
SENATOR KENNEDY	SENATOR MCCAIN
SENATOR SHELBY	

NOTE: Senator Nunn and Senator Warner, as Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Armed Services Committee, serve as ex officio (non-voting) Members of all subcommittees.

RELATIONSHIP OF ANNUAL AUTHORIZATION TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

History of Section 138, Title 10, United States Code

(Superseding "Section 412")

The jurisdiction of the committee so far as specific annual authorizations are concerned was increased significantly in 1959 by the enactment of section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149 which required annual congressional authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft missiles, and naval vessels. That law was amended and expanded as follows:

In 1962 (Public Law 88–436) to require similar authorization of appropriations for research, development, test, or evaluation associated with aircraft missiles, and naval vessels;

In 1963 (Public Law 88–174) to require similar authorization of appropriations for all research, development, test, or evaluation carried on by the Department of Defense;

In 1965 (Public Law 89–37) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

In 1967 (Public Law 90–168) to require annual authorization of the personnel strengths of each of the Selected Reserves of the Reserve components as a prior condition for the appropriation of funds for the pay and allowances for the Reserve components;

In 1969 (Public Law 91–121) to require authorization of appropriations for the procurement of other weapons to or for the use of any armed force of the United States. (Essentially, heavy, medium, and light artillery, antiaircraft artillery, rifles, machineguns, mortars, small arms weapons, and any crew-fired piece using fixed ammunition);

In 1970 (Public Law 91–441) to require authorization of appropriations to or for the use of the Navy for the procurement of torpedoes and related support equipment; and to require authorization of the average annual active duty personnel strength for each component of the Armed Forces as a condition precedent to the appropriation of funds for this purpose;

In 1972 (Public Law 92–436) to require annual authorization for the average military training student loads for each component of the Armed Forces, and modified the provisions relating to authorization for active duty personnel strength;

In 1973 (Public Law 93–155) to require authorization for end strength civilian employment for each component of the Defense Department in each fiscal year;

In 1975 (Public Law 94–106) to require the annual authorization of military construction of ammunition facilities;

In 1980 (Public Law 96–342) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for the operation and maintenance of

any armed force or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for fiscal years beginning after September 30, 1981; and

In 1982 (Public Law 97-86) to require the annual authorization of appropriations of funds for procurement of ammunition or other procurement for any armed force or for agencies of the Department of Defense (other than military departments).

Also, in 1973 these enactments were codified by section 803(a) of Public Law 93-155 into the Title 10, United States Code, as section 138. The law today reads as follows:

§ 138. Annual authorization of appropriations and personnel strengths for the armed forces; annual manpower requirements and operations and maintenance reports

(a) No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year to or for the use of any armed force or obligated or expended for—

(1) procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels;

(2) any research, development, test, or evaluation, or procurement or production related thereto;

(3) procurement of tracked combat vehicles;

(4) procurement of other weapons;

(5) procurement of naval torpedoes and related support equipment;

(6) military construction (as defined in subsection (f)); or

(7) the operation and maintenance of any armed forces or the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

(8) procurement of ammunition; or

(9) other procurement by any armed force or by the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments);

unless funds therefor have been specifically authorized by law.

(b)(1) Congress shall authorize the average personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each reserve component of the Armed Forces. No funds may be appropriated for any fiscal year for the pay and allowances of members of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces unless the personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of that Reserve component for that fiscal year has been authorized by law.

(2) The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Congress each year, not later than February 15, a written report concerning the equipment of the National Guard and the Reserve components of the Armed Forces for each of the three succeeding fiscal years. Each such report shall include—

(A) recommendations as to the type and quantity of each major item of equipment which should be in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces;

(B) the quantity and average age of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be physically available in the inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each Reserve component as of the beginning of each fiscal year covered by the report;

(C) the quantity and cost of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be procured for the Selective Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each Reserve component from commercial sources or to be transferred to each such Selected Reserved from the active-duty components of the Armed Forces; and

(D) the quantity of each type of major item of equipment which is expected to be retired, decommissioned, transferred, or otherwise removed from the physical inventory of the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve of each component and the plans for replacement of that equipment.

The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared and expressed in the same format and with the same level of detail as the information presented in the annual Five Year Defense Program Procurement Annex prepared by the Department of Defense.

ACTIVITIES OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE DURING THE 100TH CONGRESS (1987 AND 1988)

There follows a review of the activities of the Armed Services Committee during the 100th Congress (1987–1988). This period of time has been marked by an extraordinary amount of hard work by the Members and staff of the Committee and has lead to major accomplishments in terms of providing for and overseeing our national defense. In addition, the Committee has also made major improvements in its organization, administration, and procedures over this period.

Subcommittee Reorganization

Early in 1987, the Armed Services Committee prepared for the work of the 100th Congress by reorganizing its subcommittee structure into six subcommittees: three with a mission orientation and three with a functional orientation. This structure is designed to enhance the Committee's oversight of military missions, military commands, and defense agencies as well as budget accounts. A paper describing the Chairman's approach to the subcommittee structure appears at the end of this section as Exhibit A.

In order to sharpen its focus on the major defense missions of the United States and to give impetus to an effort to examine broad policy issues, the Committee created a new Subcommittee on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense. Toward the same ends, it also carefully delineated the mission, command, and resource jurisdictions of all three of the mission subcommittees: the Subcommittees on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence, Projection Forces and Regional Defense, and Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense. These subcommittees were charged with linking missions, policies, regions, and programs instead of just reviewing budget line items, such as those in the research and development and procurement accounts.

At the same time, the previous two Subcommittees on Preparedness and Military Construction were consolidated into a larger, more comprehensive Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability, and Support. The purpose of this merger was to ensure that the tools needed to operate, sustain, and support our fighting units were examined as a whole. Finally, the scope of the former Defense Acquisition Policy Subcommittee was changed to focus more on the defense technology base and the need to maintain a robust defense research and development program and the U.S. technological lead. The new title of the "Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology" reflects a broader set of responsibilities and this key new focus. The Manpower and Personnel Subcommittee remained unchanged.

National Security Strategy Hearings

With its new subcommittee structure in place, the Armed Services Committee began its legislative work in 1987 even before the President submitted his defense budget request to the Congress in February. In early January, the full Committee initiated an extensive series of hearings on U.S. national security strategy and its military strategy component. Over the course of four months, the Armed Services Committee conducted a total of 16 hearings on a wide variety of topics bearing on our national security strategy. Testimony was taken from 34 distinguished civilian and military witnesses from the Executive Branch, research institutions, and the private sector. At the conclusion of these hearings, the Committee published a 1,112 page hearing volume, which marked the first time in many years that a Committee in Congress had reviewed U.S. national security strategy in such a comprehensive fashion.

Strategy is the logical starting point for both the development and consideration of our national security policies and budgets. Therefore, these hearings in early 1987 formed a baseline or framework which the Committee subsequently used to evaluate the policies and programs in the President's defense budget requests for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. In addition, they provided the strategic context for the Committee's review of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty in 1988 and its relationship to NATO defense. It is the Committee's intent to review U.S. national security strategy at the beginning of each Congress.

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989

From the strategy hearings, the Committee turned to a detailed review of the defense budget request for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. Following the traditional presentation of the defense budget request by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, additional overview hearings were held by the full Committee with witnesses from the Congressional Budget Office, the General Accounting Office, and the Defense Department. These hearings put the defense budget in the broader context of the entire Federal budget and addressed the critical issue of the implications of static defense spending levels over the next several years for current and planned defense programs.

The Armed Services Committee then reviewed the contents of the President's defense budget request with detailed briefings for the Committee and personal staff on the programs in the budget request. These staff briefings were designed to address detailed issues so that the Members could focus during full Committee and subcommittee hearings primarily on major issues and policy questions. Reflecting its new subcommittee structure, the Committee tried to concentrate on broad defense missions and outputs instead of individual line item inputs.

To underscore the key role of the warfighting commanders in the field, who are responsible for our day-to-day military capability, the committee invited these commanders to testify before the Committee prior to the leadership of the military Services. Then the Service Secretaries and Service Chiefs of Staff appeared as separate groups to emphasize the need for joint approaches to defense re-

quirements. In addition, the Committee asked the Services' leadership to relate their budget requests to the needs of the warfighting commanders, as required by the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.

The actual mark-up of the bill began on April 27, 1987 and lasted two and a half weeks. Unfortunately, however, the authorization process then came to a halt after the bill, S. 1174, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 was reported from the Armed Services Committee on May 8. Because of a filibuster by Senators opposed to a provision in the bill that would restrict the testing of space-based Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) systems, the Senate was unable to begin debating the authorization bill until September 11, 1987. This provision was ultimately modified in conference to prohibit the Defense Department from deviating from the Strategic Defense Initiative testing plan that it had presented to the Congress during the fiscal year 1988 budget hearings. This testing plan was consistent with the traditional interpretation of the ABM Treaty.

Once Senate debate on the bill began, it consumed three full weeks, including one Saturday session. A total of 118 amendments were considered and 52 roll call votes conducted, more than for any other defense authorization bill since the Senate instituted annual authorization legislation in 1961. Similarly, the Senate spent more hours in debate on this bill than at any time except during the peak two years of the Vietnam conflict.

The conference with the House of Representatives that followed Senate approval of the bill on October 2, 1987 was a massive undertaking. The 12 Senate conferees and 78 House conferees were confronted with hundreds of language differences between the Senate and House bills, and literally thousands of differences in funding for individual defense programs. There were some deep and fundamental policy differences, particularly in the arms control area, between the Senate and House bills, and between the Congress and the Administration. However, intense negotiations with the House and the Administration over the course of a month resulted in a number of compromises that finally allowed the conference to complete its work. The conference agreement was then approved by the House on November 18, 1987 and the Senate on November 19 and signed into law by the President on December 4 (Public Law 100–180).

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 generally struck a balance among the four pillars of a sound defense: readiness, sustainability, modernization, and force structure. In specific budgetary terms, the Act minimized, to the maximum extent possible, funding reductions to readiness and sustainability programs; allowed higher, more efficient production rates for important conventional weapon systems; and increased the investment in high technology research. At the same time, noting the very significant increases that had already occurred since 1980, the Act reduced the substantial funding that had been requested for the research and procurement of strategic weapon systems.

Two-Year Defense Budgeting

For the first time in its history, the Armed Services Committee reported in 1987 a two-year defense authorization bill for most of the programs under its jurisdiction. In response to an amendment sponsored by the Chairman in the fiscal year 1986 Defense Authorization Act, the President submitted a two-year budget request for defense programs for fiscal years 1988 and 1989. Stability and predictability in defense budget levels are extremely important for efficient and effective defense expenditures. Two year budgeting contributes directly to greater budget stability and permits the Executive and Legislative Branches to spend more time on execution and oversight and less time drowning in annual budget detail.

The Committee made a concerted effort to implement the two-year budget to the maximum extent possible. However, the overall budget request for fiscal year 1989 that the President submitted early in 1987 failed to meet the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit reduction target for fiscal year 1989. This shortfall made it impossible for the Committee to establish an overall spending level for national defense in fiscal year 1989. Nonetheless, by focusing on stable, non-controversial programs in the second year of the budget request, the conference on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 was able to approve two-thirds of the request for fiscal year 1989. The original Senate bill had included over 75 percent of the second year request. Unfortunately, difficulties in the appropriations process and the large defense spending reductions of $33 billion required in fiscal year 1989 by the budget summit agreement of November 1987 made it necessary to enact a separate authorization bill for fiscal year 1989.

In spite of these difficulties, the Committee was generally pleased with the results of this first attempt at biennial budgeting. It is clear that it can and should work. Two-year budgeting will improve congressional oversight of defense programs and achieve long-term savings and better management of national security programs as the Defense Department and the defense industry stabilize their planning and procurement processes.

Review of the INF Treaty

The first order of business for the Armed Services Committee in the 2nd Session of the 100th Congress was an extensive and detailed examination of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty and its relationship to NATO defense. On the eve of the Washington summit at which the INF Treaty was signed, the Majority Leader and the Chairmen of the Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence agreed that the three Committees would work together on the Senate's review of the Treaty. In particular, each Committee would provide a report to the Senate within its specific areas of expertise on the Treaty and its ramifications.

The Armed Services Committee's objective was to establish a broad strategic framework in which the INF Treaty and other critical NATO defense issues could be comprehensively examined. The Committee focused specifically on the requirements for maintaining and strengthening NATO's conventional and nuclear deterrent posture in the environment brought about by the attainment of an

INF Treaty. This review considered NATO strategy, the military balance in Europe, conventional force improvements, Alliance resource policies, conventional arms control policy, and theater nuclear weapons modernization. The Armed Services Committee also coordinated with the Foreign Relations and Intelligence Committees on specific issues related to details of the Treaty and verification.

As part of its inquiry, the Committee conducted 29 hearings on "NATO Defense and the INF Treaty." The Committee's witnesses included the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Service Chiefs, the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and such distinguished outside experts as Dr. James Schlesinger, Dr. Harold Brown, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick.

After examining the broad issues of NATO defense, the Committee turned its attention to the Treaty itself and devoted substantial effort to establishing an authoritative baseline as to its meaning. The Committee comprehensively reviewed possible ambiguities in the Treaty text, particularly in the area of futuristic, or "exotic", types of conventionally-armed ground-launched cruise missiles (GLCMs), and identified an extensive list of questions concerning necessary clarifications. In four days of hearings with Ambassador Glitman, the Chief Negotiator on INF, and his negotiating team, the Committee went through the Treaty on an article-by-article basis and elicited detailed answers to these questions. These sessions included a day-long hearing with Ambassador Glitman on questions related to the negotiating history.

In order to reach agreement on its report on the INF Treaty, the Armed Services Committee conducted three days of mark-up meetings, discussing in detail various options for dealing with issues that arose during the hearings. On March 28, 1988, the Committee approved a report to the Senate that incorporated a series of recommendations and possible understandings. The Committee worked diligently to ensure that all of its hearings were printed and available prior to the Senate floor debate on the INF Treaty. As a result, the Committee published the first hearing volume on March 23, 1988 and eventually issued a total of five volumes. Members of the Committee were deeply involved in the Senate floor debate on the INF Treaty and a key amendment on the Treaty's application to future INF weapons and certain important verification procedures was cosponsored by the Committee leadership.

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989

In November 1987, the President and the Congress reached a deficit reduction agreement that specified a defense spending level for fiscal year 1989 much lower than that requested by the President in 1987. As a result, early in the 2nd Session of the 100th Congress, the President submitted a revision, or amendment, to the second year of this original two-year budget request. This revised budget request formed the basis for the Armed Services Committee's consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1989.

Although the authorization process within the Committee, on the Senate floor, and in the Senate-House conference unfolded in much

95-994 O - 89 - 2

the same sequence as in the past, it proceeded in a much more orderly and timely fashion in 1988. Evidence of this accelerated schedule is found in the almost 50 percent decrease from 1987 in the number of days of Committee mark-up, days of Senate floor debate, roll call votes, and hours of Senate debate. The most important reasons for this dramatic change were the consensus that had been reached on the overall level of defense spending for fiscal year 1989 and the work that the Committee had done in 1987 on the second year of the President's original biennial budget request. This, again, underscores the value of two year budgets.

The result was a conference agreement between the Senate and House of Representatives that was presented to the Senate for its approval on July 14, 1988—the earliest date that the Senate has been able to consider the conference report on the defense authorization bill in the last 10 years. The President, however, then vetoed this conference agreement on August 3.

Despite this disappointment, the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees worked with officials of the Executive Branch during the month of September to assemble a second conference agreement. This conference report to accompany H.R. 4481 differed from the original, vetoed conference report in only six areas. Both the Senate and House approved the conference report on September 28, 1988 and the President signed it on September 29 (Public Law 100–456).

One aspect of the complex situation in which this new authorization bill was enacted bears mentioning. At one point in the proceedings, the original Senate authorization bill was both included by reference in the defense appropriations bill *and* passed again as a separate piece of legislation. When the decision was made late on the afternoon of September 27, 1988 to move forward with a separate bill, the staff—to their great credit—was able to incorporate the necessary changes into the bill and statement of managers overnight, it was filed in the Senate in the morning, and both Houses approved it the same day. The President then signed it into law within a day of passage and before the appropriations bill.

The content of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 was largely shaped by the need to reduce the original budget request for fiscal year 1989 by $33 billion or 10 percent. To meet this demanding budget target, Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci made the difficult decision to reduce the size of the existing force structure and to terminate older or marginal weapon programs in order to maintain ready and capable military forces. The conference agreement on the fiscal year 1989 authorization act incorporated this approach and resisted any attempts to reverse these difficult decisions.

Drug Interdiction

In June 1988, the Committee held an important series of hearings, including a joint hearing with the House Armed Services Committee, on the critical question of how to most usefully and responsibly involve the military in the war on drugs. During floor debate on the fiscal year 1989 defense authorization bill, the Senate had approved a provision on drug interdiction that required careful

review. In addition, the Senate's position on this issue was very different from that in the House bill.

The hearings were held against the backdrop of widespread discontent with the present effort to stem the tide of illicit drugs. This frustration had led to calls for more dramatic and even drastic changes in the role of the military, including assigning the unrealistic mission of sealing the borders to the armed forces and authorizing military personnel to arrest suspects. Testimony was received from the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Defense, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and experts on the subject of drug abuse and drug interdiction.

The hearings succeeded in promoting a thoughtful, careful debate on the appropriate role of the military in the war on drugs. As a result of the hearings, an agreement was developed in the conference on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 to significantly increase the role of the Department of Defense in the national effort against drug trafficking in an effective and responsible manner.

Because intelligence is the key to a successful drug interdiction program, the conference agreement required the Secretary of Defense to ensure that civilian law enforcement officials are promptly provided with intelligence information collected by the armed forces that is related to drug interdiction. The conferees directed the Secretary of Defense to work with the Director of Central Intelligence to ensure that the collection of drug interdiction information is established as a high priority for the intelligence community.

Under the conference agreement, the armed forces will concentrate on the detection and monitoring of air and sea traffic, a role that is consistent with the traditional military mission. By undertaking the major role in air and sea surveillance, the military can eliminate the unnecessary duplication of assets and efforts by civilian agencies, and enable those agencies to focus on the law enforcement activities for which they are trained and equipped.

The conferees recognized that the magnitude of the drug problem has led to calls for the military to be directly involved in search, seizure, and arrests. The conferees, however, did not believe that it was appropriate to make such a radical break with the historic separation between military and civilian functions without clear and compelling evidence that such an action would result in a substantial reduction in the drug problem. The hearings established a record which permitted a bipartisan agreement that there should not be any relaxation of the current restrictions on the use of the military to search, seize, and arrest.

Oversight of Energy Department Defense Activities

The conference agreement on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 contains sweeping new legislation to provide independent safety oversight of the defense-related nuclear facilities and operations of the Department of Energy (DOE). This legislation creates a five-member board to review standards relating to the design, construction, operation, and decommissioning of DOE defense nuclear facilities. This board will also make recom-

mendations to ensure that public health and safety are adequately protected at these facilities.

This legislation, on which the Armed Services Committee held five hearings in 1987, is made even more urgent by recent disclosures concerning the operation of our defense nuclear facilities. Recent events raise important questions about the safety procedures and operator training at the Savannah River Plant, the Rocky Flats Plant, and other locations.

In other areas of the DOE defense programs, the conference approved the recommendation of the Senate Armed Services Committee to add $50 million for environmental restriction of DOE defense facilities, an area that has been grossly underfunded in the past.

Base Closure and Realignment Act

The last major piece of defense legislation sponsored by the Armed Services Committee in the 100th Congress was S. 2749, the Defense Authorization Amendments for Fiscal Year 1989 and Base Closure and Realignment Act. The Senate version of this groundbreaking legislation was first approved on May 27, 1988 as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989. On July 12, the House passed a similar bill. The conference agreement on S. 2749 was then approved by both Houses on October 12 and sent to the President for his signature on October 24, 1988 (Public Law 100-526).

Earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Carlucci recognized the need to reduce the structure of military bases in the United States. After extensive consultations between the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and Secretary Carlucci, a consensus was reached around the following concept: An Executive Branch Base Closure Commission would make a set of recommendations to the Secretary of Defense. If the Secretary accepted these recommendations, he would submit them to the Congress for its review and implementation.

In May 1988, Secretary Carlucci formed a bipartisan Base Closure and Realignment Commission. What was still lacking was a means of executing the Commission's recommendations in an expedited manner that still preserved strong congressional oversight. Title II of S. 2749 responded to this problem in three ways:

First, it established a decision-making process for the Secretary of Defense and review procedures for the Congress.

Second, it selectively waived key laws that have delayed or frustrated closure proposals in the past.

Third, it provided a flexible structure to fund the upfront costs of closing and realigning military bases before the annual savings are realized.

In light of the tremendous constraints on defense spending, this legislation offers an opportunity to eventually realize badly-needed savings in future defense budgets.

Allegations of Procurement Fraud

In June 1988, the Committee learned that the Federal Bureau of Investigation had initiated a major investigation involving significant allegations of fraud in the defense acquisition process.

The Armed Services Committee held a series of hearings in order to put the allegations in perspective. Witnesses included the Comptroller General, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. David Packard, Mr. James Woosley, Mr. J. Ronald Fox, Mr. Richard Stubbing, and Dr. Lawrence J. Korb. Because the investigation was at a very early stage, the Committee was careful to ensure that the hearings were conducted in a manner that did not interfere with the investigation or any subsequent prosecutions or administrative actions.

In addition to the full Committee hearings, the Subcommitttee of Defense Industry and Technology conducted a detailed review of the interim steps undertaken by the Defense Department in response to the investigation. The testimony received by the Subcommittee from the DoD Inspector General revealed major defects in the Department's management of the acquisition process. The Subcommittee and full Committee hearings demonstrated the need for the senior leadership of the Department to undertake a more aggressive role in achieving meaningful procurement reform on a variety of issues, including the management of source selection information, the conduct of the selection process, guidance on the use of consultants, and the identification and evaluation of conflicts of interest.

Other Oversight Hearings

During the 100th Congress, the Armed Service Committee exercised oversight over various activities of the Defense Department by holding hearings in several different areas. These hearings addressed topics such as U.S. military operations in the Persian Gulf, the capabilities of our special operations forces, the conventional military balance in Europe, requirements for general and flag officers, and international armaments cooperation.

Reduced Micro-Management of Defense Activities

During its work on the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, the Committee reiterated the need to substantially reorder and improve Congress' oversight of defense activities. The Committee contended that Congress spends too much time in redundant review of the details of defense programs, focuses too much on accounting and budgeting considerations, and spends too little time on major policy issues.

Throughout the 100th Congress, the Armed Services Committee responded to this self-criticism with several steps to reduce congressional micro-management of defense activities. As previously noted, even before the Committee began its work in 1987, it reorganized its subcommittees around broad mission and resource areas. Then it held a lengthy series of strategy hearings that served to place the budget requests for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 and the INF Treaty into a comprehensive policy context.

Several changes in the Committee's consideration of the two defense authorization bills that it assembled during the 100th Congress indicate its progress in diminishing micro-management. For example, the length of the Committee's reports on these two bills declined dramatically from those of previous years. In 1987 and 1988, the reports were about 60 percent shorter than those of each of the four previous years. Also, the defense authorization confer-

ence reports in the last two years made far fewer changes to the thousands of line items in the procurement and research and development requests. In fact, the conference reports in the 100th Congress changed 30 percent fewer line items than in the 99th Congress.

In another effort to relieve the unnecessarily large administrative burden imposed upon the Defense Department by the Congress, the Committee made a conscious decision to reduce the number of "questions for the record" that Members may ask witnesses at hearings and the number of studies that the Executive Branch is required to prepare. The implementation of more formal staff briefings on the details of the budget request, coupled with the leadership decision to reduce the number of duplicative and excessive questions for the record, resulted in a reduction of almost 50 percent in the number of such questions during the 100th Congress. In terms of studies and reports, at the initiative of the Armed Services Committee, the Goldwater-Nichols Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 eliminated fully two-thirds of the existing reporting requirements. Since that legislation was enacted, the Committee has required far fewer new studies than previously. Unfortunately, other Committees have not focused on or emphasized the need to reduce micromanagement and marginal questions, studies, and reports, so additional reductions are still needed.

Finally, the defense authorization acts for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 include a number of proposals by the Armed Services Committee to increase the flexibility of Defense Department managers to execute their programs. For example, in a significant departure from historical practice, these most recent acts fund several milestone authorization programs for five years. Instead of having to rely on annual authorizations for their funding, these programs were authorized for their entire research and development and up to five years of their procurement. In addition, the Committee continued to work with the Defense Department in identifying and authorizing new multiyear programs.

Improvements to the Committee's Administration

The final activities that should be noted are the Committee's efforts to improve its own administrative practices and procedures. In particular, during the 100th Congress, the Committee strengthened its procedures governing the consideration of civilian statutory nominations and the handling of classified material.

During the 100th Congress, the Committee considered 36 nominations for senior civilian positions in the Department of Defense. In order to effectively carry out its important responsibility to review these statutory nominations, the Committee developed and published a set of procedures that specifies information and requirements that nominees must fulfill as part of their consideration by the Committee. Also, new rules were formalized that govern the scope of the investigations conducted into nominees and the Committee's review of FBI background reports. The leadership and other Members of the Armed Services Committee are committed to continuing this close scrutiny of statutory nominations.

A total of 87,177 military nominations were considered by the Committee during the 100th Congress. A number of these nomina-

tions were controversial and required a large amount of the Committee's time and effort. For example, the Committee uncovered substantial irregularities in the conduct of a Marine Corps promotion board for Major Generals and held a series of six meetings on this matter. An extensive report was prepared and only eight of the ten officers on the promotion list were approved. As a result of this investigation, the Committee made changes to the statutes governing promotion boards to ensure their objectivity and to preclude undue influence.

Because it handles a large volume of classified documents, the Committee established and formalized stringent rules for the handling of this sensitive material and for obtaining security clearances. These procedures not only comply with the regulations promulgated by the Executive Agencies from whom the Committee receives classified documents, but they are more strict than those established by the Office of Senate Security as well.

The Committee has always sought to conduct its business in the most cost-effective manner. For example, at the beginning of the 100th Congress, the Committee decided not to reprint in our hearing volumes all of the standard military posture statements which are available from the Government Printing Office and House records. This decision resulted in a 16 percent decrease in our printing costs from the previous year while, at the same time, we printed a significantly larger number of hearings.

It should also be mentioned that the Committee's very busy schedule during the second session of the 100th Congress proceeded during a major renovation of the Committee's office spaces. This renovation resulted in a much more efficient and effective use of the same amount of space. Despite this significant disruption, the staff maintained the high quality and quantity of their work.

The foregoing review should convey a sense of how busy and productive the Armed Services Committee was during the 100th Congress. A table displaying numerical measures of the Committee's workload appears at the end of this section as Exhibit B. Although statistics alone cannot convey the full measure of the Committee's work, they do provide a useful insight.

The Committee looks forward to building on its record of accomplishments in the 101st Congress.

EXHIBIT A

Paper by Chairman Sam Nunn Regarding the Subcommittee Structure for the Committee on Armed Services

STRENGTHENED MISSION-ORIENTED SUBCOMMITTEE STRUCTURE FOR THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

In preparing a proposed organization for the Armed Services Committee, I reviewed the history of the Armed Services Committee since it was formed in 1948 by combining the Military Affairs and Naval Affairs Committees. The various subcommittee organizations were studied, and their strengths and weaknesses were analyzed. The major missions of the Department of Defense were also examined. In particular, I evaluated the impact of the shift from a subcommittee organization along budgetary categories such as pro-

curement, research and development, operation and maintenance, and so forth, to the "mission approach" organization which was adopted in 1981. This focus on major military missions, to tasks, of the Department of Defense has allowed the Committee to improve its ability to relate the budget request to the national security goals that we were trying to achieve.

Our goal in this new subcommittee organization is to strengthen the mission orientation of the subcommittees and improve their ability to deal with overlapping issues as well as oversight of the Department of Defense. This organization will also help Congress improve its supervision of broad policy issues rather than focus disproportionately on budget accounting details.

Four subcommittees will be responsible for specific Department of Defense missions. They will oversee the military warfighting commands responsible for executing those missions, those defense agencies and elements of the Military Departments responsible for supporting those missions, and those research and development and procurement programs related to those missions. Subcommittees will also be given special additional areas for focus as well as a series of specific questions for resolution to guide their work. There will need to be close cooperation among the subcommittees, specifically those that have overlapping responsibilities in terms of major military missions, warfighting commands, and research and procurement programs.

Two subcommittees—Readiness, Sustainability and Support and Manpower and Personnel—will continue to have a functional orientation. However, the work of these subcommittees should be guided by the requirements of the major military missions of the Department of Defense.

It was with both this approach in mind and the need to ensure that all elements of the Department of Defense are joined in a coherent whole that I am recommending the following subcommittee structure:

CONVENTIONAL FORCES AND ALLIANCE DEFENSE

The Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense subcommittee will have as its primary focus two key military missions—defense of NATO and of East Asia, particularly Northeast Asia. This subcommittee will oversee the major warfighting commands with these responsibilities, including the U.S. European Command, the U.S. Atlantic Command, and the U.S. Pacific Command—the latter two jointly with the Projection Forces subcommittee. Special focus will be on the need to improve cooperation and coordination with our allies and to improve cooperative weapons research and procurement. The subcommittee will review the appropriate assigned elements of the Military Departments that support these key missions and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

Its budget oversight duties will include those research and procurement programs and activities related to conventional forces in support of those military missions, including land combat equipment such as tanks and artillery pieces, tactical aviation such as helicopters and fighters, and tactical missiles. The subcommittee

will also review, on a collaborative basis with the Projection Forces subcommittee, those overlapping aspects of naval programs.

PROJECTION FORCES AND REGIONAL DEFENSE

This subcommittee will be concerned with the military missions of defense of Southwest Asia and of other regional areas where the United States does not have substantial forces deployed in peacetime. It will also review policies and programs for the sea control and maritime force projection missions needed in regional areas as well as in NATO and East Asia.

It will have special responsibilities for looking at the requirements of low intensity conflict as well as the security assistance programs. It will oversee these military commands: the U.S. Southern Command, the U.S. Atlantic Command and the U.S. Pacific Command—the latter two jointly with the Conventional Forces Subcommittee. It will oversee assigned elements of the Military Departments, the Joint Deployment Agency, the Military Sealift Command, the Military Traffic Management Command, and the Defense Security Assistance Agency.

It will have responsibility for those budget elements of research and procurement related to these force projection missions, including airlift and sealift programs, Marine Corps programs, and amphibious warfare programs. Overlapping naval programs will be reviewed by the Conventional Forces Subcommittee as well.

STRATEGIC FORCES AND NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

The Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence Subcommittee will have responsibility for review of one of the primary Department of Defense missions—deterrence. In addition to reviewing U.S. policy and doctrine in this area, the subcommittee will be responsible for oversight of the major military commands that support the mission of nuclear deterrence, including the Strategic Air Command, the U.S. Space Command, and the Aerospace Defense Command. The subcommittee will review the programs and activities of those defense agencies directly involved in strategic issues, including the Defense Nuclear Agency and the Defense Mapping Agency.

This subcommittee will review the major research and development and procurement budget accounts in the area of strategic offensive and defensive forces, including ballistic missiles, nuclear warheads, strategic bombers, and ballistic missile submarines. It will also have oversight of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization and the research and development activities which constitute the Strategic Defense Initiative. Finally, the subcommittee will have as additional responsibilities review of chemical weapons and nuclear arms control issues.

MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL

The Manpower and Personnel subcommittee will continue to have one of the largest areas of legislative oversight responsibility on the Committee. It will review defense manpower policy, including military and civilian personnel and active and reserve forces. It will also review pay and benefits, health care and mobilization capabilities. As an area of special focus, the subcommittee will review

the personnel requirements of our major hardware investment programs. It will have specific oversight responsibility for the personnel organizations of the Military Departments, the Defense Medical Support Activity, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, and the DoD Dependent Schools. Its budget oversight will include military personnel and military retirement.

DEFENSE INDUSTRY AND TECHNOLOGY

Defense Industry and Technology is a new subcommittee whose major mission focus is to marshal defense resources and policies in such a way as to ensure U.S. technological superiority over potential adversaries. The subcommittee will be looking at the health and vitality of the industrial and technological foundations of our defense programs. Its responsibilities will include the defense industrial base, the technology base, oversight of certain defense laboratories, and defense acquisition policy. The subcommittee will review the reforms stemming from the Packard Commission in the area of acquisition policy and will attempt to develop sound policy foundations for our technological base. Those foundations must be based on a thorough review of the management and personnel policies in the DoD and DoE laboratories.

The subcommittee is responsible for the national defense stockpile policies and programs as well as technology transfer. Its oversight of specific DoD agencies includes the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and his organization, the Defense Investigative Services, the Defense Contract Audit Agency, the Director of Operational Test and Evalulation, and the Defense Technology Security Administration. In the budget area, the subcommittee will review the technology base research and development accounts, certain defense laboratories, and certain other technology programs.

READINESS, SUSTAINABILITY AND SUPPORT

This subcommittee has as its primary focus the readiness of U.S. military forces, including the training, support and wartime sustainability of those forces. The subcommittee will also review the installations requirements of the forces. This subcommittee will have a broad charter to oversee two key measures of military capability—the ability to go to war today and the ability to sustain deployed forces as required during conflict. It will oversee appropriate defense agencies in this area, such as the Defense Logistics Agency and the Defense Communications Agency. The subcommittee will review those elements of the budget which are primarily associated with the operations and maintenance of our forces, and with those items of procurement particularly related to readiness, such as conventional ammunition and spare parts. It will also review the budget for military construction.

EXHIBIT B

	100th Congress, First Session	100th Congress, Second Session	Total
DoD authorization:			
Days in markup	14	9	23
Days on floor	15	8	23
Amendments	118	97	215
Roll call votes	52	26	78
Hours of debate	115	61	176
Hearings/meetings:			
Full Committee	70	65	135
Strategic Subcommittee	26	19	45
Conventional Subcommittee	10	4	14
Projection Subcommittee	4	3	7
Defense Industry Subcommittee	7	6	13
Readiness Subcommittee	6	7	13
Manpower Subcommittee	7	5	12
Joint Sessions (Projection and Conventional)	4	0	4
Joint Sessions (Conventional and Defense Industry)	3	0	3
Joint Sessions (Strategic and Conventional)	0	1	1
Joint Sessions (Readiness and Manpower)	0	1	1
Total	137	111	248
Statutory nominations	21	15	36
Military nominations:			
Army	14,448	12,861	27,309
Navy	12,101	10,205	22,306
Marine Corps	1,995	1,596	3,591
Air Force	18,667	15,304	33,971
Total	47,211	39,966	87,177

HEARINGS ON NOMINATIONS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

[Unless otherwise indicated, all persons listed below personally appeared before committee or subcommittee in open session, and were subsequently approved by the committee]

Date considered by committee	Name	Date confirmed by Senate
Mar. 22, 1988	Alvarez, Everett, Jr., of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for a term expiring May 1, 1993, vice Perry Albert Lambird, term expired (Note: The nominee did not appear).	Mar. 23, 1988
Mar. 21, 22, 1988	Ball, William Lockhart III, of South Carolina, to be Secretary of the Navy, vice James H. Webb, Jr., resigned.	Mar. 23, 1988
Dec. 10, 1987	Bergquist, Kenneth P., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, vice Chapman B. Cox, resigned. (Note: Appeared in both open and closed session and outside witnesses also testified).	
May 27; June 10, 1988	Bergquist, Kenneth P., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), vice Charles G. Untermeyer, resigned.	June 16, 1988
Oct. 14, 20, 1987	Brown, June Gibbs, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of Defense, vice Joseph H. Sherick, resigned. (Note: On Oct. 28, 1987, by unanimous consent, this nomination was referred to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs for a period not to exceed 20 days. On Nov. 10, 1987, the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs was discharged).	Nov. 13, 1987
Oct. 9, 20, 1987	Buck, Kathleen A., of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Defense, vice H. Lawrence Garrett III.	Oct. 23, 1987
Nov. 12, 13, 1987	Carlucci, Frank C., of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense (Confirmed by the Senate by a vote of 91–1).	Nov. 20, 1987
June 24, 28, 1988	Chu, David S.C., of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Program Analysis and Evaluation) (New Position—P.L. 100–180).	July 12, 1988
Feb. 25, Mar. 10, 1987	Costello, Robert B., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Logistics), vice James P. Wade, Jr.	Mar. 11, 1987
Nov. 19, 1987	Costello, Robert B., of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, vice Richard P. Godwin, resigned.	Dec. 17, 1987
Sept. 29, 1987	Crowe, Admiral William J., Jr., USN, for reappointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.	Oct. 1, 1987
Dec. 11, 15, 1987	Duncan, Robert C., of Massachusetts, to be Director of Defense Research and Engineering, vice Donald Alden Hicks, resigned.	Dec. 17, 1987
Oct. 16, 20, 1987	Duncan, Stephen M., of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs), vice James H. Webb, Jr., resigned.	Oct. 23, 1987
May 20, 1988	Elkins, Alan Marshall, of Maine, to be a Member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for a term expiring May 1, 1993, vice David I. Olch, deceased (Note: The nominee did not appear).	May 23, 1988
Dec. 18, 1987	Faught, Thomas F., Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Engineering and Systems), vice Melvyn R. Paisley, resigned (Note: Appeared in both closed and open session).	Dec. 19, 1987
May 20, 29, 1987	Galvin, General John R., USA, to be reappointed to the grade of General and to be assigned as the Commander in Chief, United States European Command, and to serve as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.	June 3, 1987
Aug. 4, 1987	Garrett, H. Lawrence III, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Navy, vice James F. Goodrich, resigned.	Aug. 5, 1987
Oct. 4, 13, 1988	Glaister, Clyde O., of Virginia, to be Comptroller of the Department of Defense (New Position—P.L. 99–433).	Oct. 14, 1988
June 24, 1987	Gray, Lieutenant General Alfred M., Jr., USMC, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps.	June 25, 1987

[Unless otherwise indicated, all persons listed below personally appeared before committee or subcommittee in open session, and were subsequently approved by the committee]

Date considered by committee	Name	Date confirmed by Senate
Jan. 28, 29, 1988	Green, Grant S., Jr., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management and Personnel), vice Robert Clifton Duncan.	Feb. 2, 1988
Jan. 28, 1987	Herres, General Robert T., USAF, to be Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff	Jan. 31, 1987
Jan. 28, 29, 1988	Howard, J. Daniel, of Tennessee, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), vice Robert B. Sims, resigned.	Feb. 2, 1988
Mar. 3, 22, 1988	Katzen, Jack, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Production and Logisitics), vice Robert B. Costello.	Mar. 23, 1988
Oct. 11, 13, 1988	Keesling, Karen R., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), vice Tidal W. McCoy, resigned.	Oct. 14, 1988
Sept. 23, 29, 1988	Kramer, Ken, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management), vice Michael P.W. Stone.	Oct. 14, 1988
Feb. 1, 4, 1988	Lehman, Ronald F., II, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Policy), vice Richard N. Perle, resigned.	Feb. 16, 1988
Nov. 24; Dec. 15, 1987	Lessey, Samuel K., Jr., of New Hampshire, to be Director of Selective Service, vice Thomas K. Turnage.	Dec. 17, 1987
Sept. 14, 29, 1988	Lohr, Milton R., of California, to be Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition (New Position).	Sept. 30, 1988
Oct. 12, 13, 1988	Monahan, Lieutenant General George L., Jr., USAF, to be reassigned in the grade of lieutenant general and to be Director of the Strategic Defense Initiative Organization, Office of the Secretary of Defense.	Oct. 14, 1988
Dec. 1, 15, 1987	Page, Robert W., Sr., of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), vice Robert K. Dawson, resigned.	Dec. 17, 1987
Dec. 15, 1987	Powell, Lieutenant General Colin L., U.S. Army, to be reassigned in the grade of lieutenant general (Note: The reassignment was to serve as the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. A nomination hearing was not conducted).	Dec. 18, 1987
May 13, 20, 1988	Smith, Gordon A., of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control Communications and Intelligence, vice Donald C. Latham, resigned.	May 23, 1988
Dec. 18, 1987	Smith, T. Burton, Jr., of California, to be a Member of the Board of Regents of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences for a term expiring May 1, 1993, vice James F.X. O'Rourke, term expired (Note: The nominee did not appear).	Dec. 19, 1987
May 13, 20, 1988	Stone, Michael P.W., of California, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice James R. Ambrose, resigned.	May 23, 1988
Apr. 6, 8, 1987	Webb, James H., Jr., of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Navy, vice John F. Lehman, Jr., resigned.	Apr. 9, 1987
June 24, 28, 1988	Whitehouse, Charles S., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict), vice Chapman B. Cox, resigned.	July 12, 1988
Oct. 9, 20, 1987	Welch, John J., Jr., of Texas, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Research, Development & Logistics), vice Thomas Edward Cooper, resigned (Note: Appeared in both closed and open session).	Oct. 23, 1987
June 10, 11, 1987	Vuono, General Carl E., USA, to be Chief of Staff of the United States Army	June 16, 1987

NOMINATIONS FOR PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED FORCES

The committee considered nominations for promotions in the armed services. Nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for confirmation resulted in the following:

First Session

January 3 through December 22, 1987

Air Force nominations, totaling 18,667, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	15,711
Unconfirmed	2,955
Returned	1
Army nominations, totaling 14,448, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	12,086
Unconfirmed	2,361
Returned	1
Navy nominations, totaling 12,101, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	12,055
Unconfirmed	46
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,995, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,983
Unconfirmed	10
Returned *	2

Second Session

January 25, through October 22, 1988

Air Force nominations, totaling 15,304 (including 2,955 nominations carried over from the first session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	15,304
Army nominations, totaling 12,861 (including 2,361 nominations carried over from the first session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	12,858
Unconfirmed	2
Withdrawn	1
Navy nominations, totaling 10,205 (including 46 nominations carried over from the first session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	10,203
Unconfirmed	1
Withdrawn	1
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 1,596 (including 10 nominations carried over from the first session), disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,595
Unconfirmed	1

* Nominations returned to the President without final action at the time of the August-September adjournment of the Senate, pursuant to provisions of Rule XXXI.

INVESTIGATIONS, HEARINGS, AND OTHER MATTERS NOT DIRECTLY PERTAINING TO LEGISLATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

(Date of Hearing and Person or Subject)

Jan. 12, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony on the national security strategy of the United States. (Witness: Caspar W. Weinberger) Open. Printed.

Jan. 13, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the national security strategy of the United States. (Witness: Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski) Open. Printed.

Jan. 13, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony on a conceptual framework for strategymaking. (Witnesses: Colonel Arthur F. Lykke, Jr., USA (Ret.), Dr. Robert S. Wood, Colonel Dennis M. Drew, USAF, and Gregory D. Foster) Open. Printed.

Jan. 14, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the national security strategy of the United States. (Witness: James R. Schlesinger) Open. Printed.

Jan. 14, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the use of operational gaming and simulation to assist strategymaking. (Witnesses: Colonel Edward C. Kielkopf, USA, Captain Joseph S. Hurlburt, USN, Mr. Orville E. Hay, Colonel C.A. Pappas, USAF, and Colonel James M. Simms, USMC) Closed. Printed with security deletions.

Jan. 20, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the national security strategy of the United States, especially its coalition aspects. (Witnesses: David M. Abshire, Dennis Kloske, and Michael Moodie) Open. Printed.

Jan. 20, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the relationship between resource constraints and U.S. military strategy. (Witnesses: Lawrence J. Korb, Richard Stubbing, and John M. Collins) Open. Printed.

Jan. 21, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the national security strategy of the United States. (Witness: Admiral William J. Crowe, USN) Open. Printed.

Jan. 27, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on U.S. military strategy in East Asia and the Pacific and in Southwest Asia. (Witnesses: Admiral Ronald J. Hays, USN, and General George B. Crist, USMC) Open and closed. Printed with security deletions.

Jan. 27, 1987

Committee met to receive an analysis of the previous testimony on U.S. national security strategy. (Witnesses: Dr. Jeffrey Record, and Colonel Harry Summers, USA (Ret.)) Open. Printed.

Jan. 28, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on U.S. military strategy for low intensity conflicts. (Witness: General Paul F. Gorman, USA (Ret.)) Open. Printed.

Feb. 3, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony providing a comprehensive budget context for the conduct of oversight responsibilities and to review the defense budget request for fiscal years 1988 and 1989 in preparation for the committee's recommendation to the Senate Budget Committee. (Witness: Dr. Rudolph Penner) Open. Printed.

Feb. 3, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the national security strategy of the United States. (Witness: George P. Shultz) Open. Printed.

Feb. 18, 1987

Committee met informally with Mr. George Younger, the British Secretary of State for Defense. Closed; not recorded.

Feb. 23, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on U.S. military strategy in the areas of responsibility of the U.S. Southern and Atlantic Commands. (Witnesses: General John R. Galvin, USA and Admiral Lee Baggett, Jr., USN) Open. Printed.

Feb. 24, 1987

Committee met to consider the Armed Services Committee recommendation to the Senate Budget Committee on the fiscal year 1988 targets for the National Defense Budget Category and to approve the Armed Services Committee Rules of Procedure for the 100th Congress. Closed and open; not printed.

Feb. 24, 1987

Committee met informally with Mr. Giovanni Spadolini, the Italian Minister of Defense. Closed; not recorded.

Mar. 25, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on U.S. military strategy in the areas of responsibility of the U.S. European Command. (Witness: General Bernard W. Rogers, USA) Open. Printed.

Mar. 30, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on the military strategy of the United States. (Witnesses: Gen. David C. Jones, USAF, (Ret.), Gen. Edward C. Meyer, USA (Ret.), and Admiral Harry D. Train II, USN (Ret.)) Open. Printed.

Apr. 3, 1987

Committee met to continue receiving testimony on U.S. national security strategy, especially the President's recent report, *National Security Strategy of the United States.* (Witnesses: Dr. Amos A. Jordan, Jr., Mr. John D. Steinbruner, and Mr. W. Bruce Weinrod) Open. Printed.

May 18, 20, 1987

Committee met to receive briefings from administration witnesses on the attack on the U.S.S. STARK in the Persian Gulf on May 17, 1987. Closed; not recorded.

June 2, 1987

Committee met to receive a briefing on the role of Iraq in the attack on the U.S.S. STARK on May 17, 1987. (Witness: Rear Admiral David N. Rogers, USN) Closed; not printed.

June 5, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony on the military implications of the administration's plan for U.S. military forces to protect "reflagged" Kuwaiti oil tankers. (Witnesses: Admiral William J. Crowe, USN, Admiral Carlisle Trost, USN, General Larry Welch, USAF, General T.R. Morgan, USMC, and Lieutenant General Robert Riscassi, USA) Open and closed. Open portion printed.

June 11, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony on the military implications of the administration's plan for U.S. military forces to protect "reflagged" Kuwaiti oil tankers. (Witnesses: Michael H. Armacost and Richard L. Armitage) Open and closed. Printed with security deletions.

June 16, 1987

Committee met to receive a briefing on the administration's report on the plan to protect 11 reflagged Kuwaiti tankers with U.S. military forces. (Witnesses: Richard L. Armitage and Vice Admi-

ral Powell F. Carter, Jr., USN) Closed. Printed with security deletions.

June 17, 1987

Committee met to receive an intelligence briefing on the Persian Gulf region. Closed; not printed.

June 19, 1987

Committee met to receive a committee staff briefing on a Marine Corps nomination list pending before the committee. Closed; not printed.

June 26, 1987

Committee met to continue to discuss a Marine Corps nomination list pending before the committee. Closed; not printed.

June 30, 1987

Committee met to continue to discuss a Marine Corps nomination list pending before the committee. Closed; not printed.

July 10, 1987

Committee met to continue to discuss a Marine Corps nomination list pending before the committee. Closed; not printed.

Sept. 14, 1987

Committee met to receive a briefing on the on-going Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) negotiations. Closed; not printed.

Sept. 22, 1987

Committee met to receive testimony on the effectiveness of legislation enacted in 1986 establishing the position of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. (Witnesses: Richard P. Godwin and Willian H. Taft IV) Open. Printed.

Jan. 25, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witnesses: Frank C. Carlucci and Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., USN) Open. (Appeared both in a morning and afternoon session) Printed.

Jan. 26, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Dr. James R. Schlesinger) Open. Printed.

Jan. 27, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance, NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. (Witnesses: Ambassador David M. Abshire and Phillip A. Karber) Open. Printed.

Jan. 27, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance, NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. (Witnesses: Senators Carl Levin and Dan Quayle) Open. Printed.

Jan. 28, 1988

Committee met informally with the Subcommittee on Defense Cooperation of the North Atlantic Assembly. Closed; not recorded.

Jan. 29, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Dr. Harold Brown) Open. Printed.

Jan. 29, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick) Open. Printed.

Feb. 1, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance, NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. (Witness: General Bernard W. Rogers, USA (Retired)) Open. Printed.

Feb. 2, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance, NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. (Witness: General John R. Galvin, USA) Open. Printed.

Feb. 2, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on European perspectives on NATO's security posture, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Ambassador Richard R. Burt) Open. Printed.

Feb. 3, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on NATO force deficiencies and improvements. (Witnesses: General Carl E. Vuono, USA, Admiral Carlisle A.H. Trost, USN, General Alfred M. Gray, Jr., USMC, and General Larry D. Welch, USAF) Open. Printed.

Feb. 3, 1988

Committee attended a meeting of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to receive testimony on the Intelligence Community's assessments of INF Treaty monitoring and verification capabilities. Closed; not printed.

Feb. 4, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance NATO military strategy, and NATO force improvements. (Witness: Richard N. Perle) Open. Printed.

Feb. 4, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the NATO-Warsaw Pact military balance. (Witnesses: Andrew W. Marshall, Lieutenant Colonel Jeff S. McKitrick, USA) Closed; not printed.

Feb. 16, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on allied perspectives on NATO's security posture, including the implications of the INF Treaty. (Witnesses: Rozanne L. Ridgway, Ambassador Ronald F. Lehman II, and Ambassador Edward L. Rowny) Open. Printed.

Feb. 16, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, with emphasis on European perspectives. (Witness: Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski) Open. Printed.

Feb. 17, 1988

Committee met with Dr. Willem van Eekelen, Minister of Defense of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Chairman of the Eurogroup Defense Ministers, to discuss the views of the Eurogroup countries on the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and related NATO defense issues. Closed; printed.

Feb. 17, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on conventional arms control and confidence-building measures in Europe. (Witnesses: Ambassador Robert D. Blackwill, Karl Kaiser, and Phillip A. Karber) Open. Printed.

Feb. 18, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on conventional arms control and confidence-building measures in Europe. (Witnesses: James A. Thomson and Charles H. Thomas) Open. Printed.

Feb. 18, 1988

Committee attended a meeting of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to receive testimony on Soviet incentives and intentions to comply with the INF Treaty. Closed; not printed.

Feb. 19, 1988

Committee met in joint session with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to receive testimony on the implications of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty for negotiating the Strategic Arms Reduction (START) Treaty. Closed; not printed. (NOTE: Transcript retained by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.)

Feb. 22, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Ambassador Maynard W. Glitman) Open. Printed.

Feb. 23, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Ambassador Maynard W. Glitman) Open. Printed.

Feb. 24, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the implications of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witnesses: Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., William R. Van Cleave, and Ambassador Evan G. Galbraith) Open. Printed.

Feb. 24, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on strategy and capabilities for NATO defense, including the implications for the Alliance of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Henry A. Kissinger) Open. Printed.

Feb. 25, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on resource policies for NATO force improvements. (Witnesses: Ambassador Alton G. Keel, Jr. and Mr. Dennis Kloske) Open. Printed.

Feb. 25, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on compliance with, and enforcement of, the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. (Witness: Paul H. Nitze) Open. Printed.

Mar. 17, 1988

Committee met in joint session with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to receive a briefing by the Central Intelligence Agency on the situation in Honduras. Closed; not printed. (NOTE: Transcript retained by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence.)

Mar. 17, 1988

Committee met to receive a briefing by Department of Defense, Joint Chiefs of Staff and Defense Intelligence Agency personnel on the military situation in Honduras. Closed; not printed.

Mar. 18, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, including issues related to the negotiating record. (Witness: Ambassador Maynard W. Glitman) Closed. Printed.

Mar. 18, 1988

Committee met to discuss completing the committee's review of the NATO Defense and the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Closed; not printed.

Mar. 23, 1988

Committee met to discuss and decide on conclusions and recommendations for inclusion in the committee report on NATO defense and the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Closed; not printed.

Mar. 24, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on INF issues related to Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles, as well as DOD Special Access Progams and "Future" Weapon Systems. Closed; Printed.

Mar. 24, 1988

Committee met to continue to discuss and decide on conclusions and recommendations for inclusion in the committee report on NATO defense and the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Closed; not printed.

Mar. 28, 1988

Committee met to continue to discuss and decide on conclusions and recommendations for inclusion in the committee report on NATO defense and the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. Closed; not printed.

Mar. 30, 1988

Committee met jointly with the House Committee on Armed Services to receive a briefing on unauthorized appropriations. Closed; not recorded.

Apr. 14, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, and future weapon systems. Closed. Printed.

June 8, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the role of the Department of Defense in drug interdiction. (Witnesses: Charles A. Bowsher, Dr. Peter Reuter, and Frank Monastero) Open. Printed. (NOTE: Members of the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee and the House Armed Services Defense Policy Panel were also invited to attend this hearing.)

June 14, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the relationship between demand reduction and the role of the military in addressing the problem of drug abuse. (Witnesses: Robert B. Morgan, Karst J. Besteman, Allan Y. Cohen, Elizabeth S. "B.J." McConnell, and Lloyd D. Johnston) Open. Printed. (NOTE: Members of the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee and the House

Armed Services Defense Policy Panel were also invited to attend this hearing.)

June 15, 1988

Committee met jointly with the House Armed Services Investigations Subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee Defense Policy Panel to continue to receive testimony on the role of the Department of Defense in drug interdiction. (Witnesses: Frank Carlucci, General Robert T. Herres, USAF and Admiral Frank B. Kelso II, USN) Open. Printed.

June 28, 1988

Committee met informally with Yitzhak Rabin, the Israeli Defense Minister. Closed; not recorded.

July 6, 1988

Committee met jointly with the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence to receive a briefing on recent combat activities in the Persian Gulf, including the shooting down of an Iranian commercial airliner by U.S. military forces. (Witnesses: Representatives of the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency) Closed.

July 8, 1988

Committee met to discuss the Fiscal Year 1989 Defense Appropriations bill and possible Armed Services Committee amendments thereto. Closed; not printed.

July 11, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the defense acquisition process. (Witnesses: Charles A. Bowsher, Frank C. Conahan, and James F. Hinchman) Open. Printed.

July 12, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the defense acquisition process. (Witnesses: Frank C. Carlucci, Robert B. Costello, and Kathleen A. Buck) Open. Printed.

July 27, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the defense acquisition process. (Witnesses: David Packard and R. James Woolsey) Open. Printed.

Aug. 4, 1988

Committee met to continue to receive testimony on the defense acquisition process with emphasis on organization and management issues. (Witnesses: J. Ronald Fox, Lawrence J. Korb, and Richard A. Stubbing) Open. Printed.

Aug. 5, 1988

Committee met informally to receive a report from Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr., USN, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, regarding his visit with Marshal of the Soviet Sergey Akhromeyev. Closed; not recorded.

Aug. 11, 1988

Committee met informally with Ambassador Charles S. Whitehouse, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, General James J. Lindsay, USA, Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command and John O. Marsh, Jr., Secretary of the Army and former acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to discuss reform and reorganization of special operations and low intensity conflict capabilities, policies, and programs. Closed; not recorded.

Sept. 8, 1988

Committee met to receive testimony on the investigation into the downing of an Iranian airliner by the U.S.S. Vincennes. (Witnesses: Rear Admiral William M. Fogarty, USN and Rear Admiral Robert J. Kelly, USN) Open. Printed.

Sept. 29, 1988

Committee met to discuss the issue of unauthorized appropriations for fiscal year 1989. Closed; not printed.

Oct. 6, 1988

Committee met jointly with the House Armed Services Committee to receive testimony on the restructuring of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program. (Witnesses: Robert B. Costello, General Robert T. Herres, USAF, and Lieutenant General James A. Abrahamson, USAF) Open. Printed.

Nov. 29, 1988

Committee met to discuss confirmation procedures and other committee-related business. Open. Printed.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF

Arnold L. Punaro, *Staff Director* (1)
Robert F. Bayer, *Professional Staff Member*
Robert G. Bell, *Professional Staff Member*
Tiffany E. Berger, *Staff Assistant* (13)
Kathryn E. Bognovitz, *Special Assistant*
Robert F. Bott, *Professional Staff Member*
Barbara L. Braucht, *Staff Assistant* (2) (23)
Romie L. Brownlee, *Deputy Minority Staff Director* (3)
Richard E. Caswell, *Printing and Documents Clerk* (12)
Lucia M. Chavez, *Security Control Officer* (21)
Brian D. Dailey, *Professional Staff Member* (17)
Christine Cowart Dauth, *Chief Clerk*
Marie Fabrizio Dickinson, *Assistant Chief Clerk*
Andrew S. Effron, *General Counsel* (4) (24)
Jonathan L. Etherton, *Professional Staff Member*
Richard D. Finn, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*
Judith A. Freedman, *Professional Staff Member*
Barbara C. Gallo, *Staff Assistant* (15)
Colleen M. Getz, *Professional Staff Member* (20)
Sherri Wasserman Goodman, *Professional Staff Member* (14)
John J. Hamre, *Professional Staff Member*
Elizabeth Ann Harlow, *Staff Assistant* (16)
William E. Hoehn, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*
Lori M. Jackson, *Staff Assistant*
George K. Johnson, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*
Mary J. Kampo, *Staff Assistant*
Ronald P. Kelly, *Professional Staff Member*
James R. Locher III, *Professional Staff Member*
David S. Lyles, *Professional Staff Member*
John N. McConnell, *System Manager* (19)
Thomas K. McConnell, *Professional Staff Member* (11)
Michael J. McCord, *Professional Staff Member* (5)
Norman G. Mosher, *Professional Staff Member* (10)
Frederick F.Y. Pang, *Professional Staff Member* (6)
Cindy Pearson, *Staff Assistant* (18)

Melissa A. Ramsey, *Receptionist* [22]
Debra A. Rice, *Staff Assistant* [7]
Mark B. Robinson, *Professional Staff Member*
Ann Elise Sauer, *Professional Staff Member*
Inga B. Schoonover, *Special Assistant*
Patrick A. Tucker, *Minority Counsel* [8]
Patricia L. Watson, *Professional Staff Member*
Daniel J. Wildfong, *Professional Staff Member*
Mickie Jan Wise, *Staff Assistant* [9]

Appointments: [1] Title changed Jan. 6, 1987; [2] Jan. 6, 1987 as Receptionist; [3] Jan. 6, 1987; [4] Jan. 6, 1987 as Counsel; [5] Jan. 7, 1987; [6] Jan. 6, 1987; [7] Jan. 6, 1987; [8] title changed Jan. 6, 1987; [9] Feb. 14, 1987; [10] Feb. 26, 1987; [11] Apr. 6, 1987; [12] May 20, 1987; [13] June 22, 1987; [14] Sept. 8, 1987; [15] Oct. 16, 1987; [16] Jan. 19, 1988; [17] Jan. 20, 1988; [18] Feb. 2, 1988; [19] Feb. 29, 1988; [20] title changed Apr. 1, 1988; [21] title changed Apr. 25, 1988; [22] June 7, 1988; [23] title changed June 7, 1988; [24] title changed Sept. 6, 1988.

Resignations: Karen A. Love resigned Feb. 13, 1987; Richard J. Keegan resigned Feb. 28, 1987; Russel E. Milnes resigned Mar. 15, 1987; Paula J. Kovacs resigned May 28, 1987; Russell C. Miller resigned June 5, 1987; Gordon G. Riggle resigned Sept. 7, 1987; Kathleen L. McGuire resigned Feb. 26, 1988; Charles R. Siegismund II resigned Feb. 29, 1988; Richelle M. Turner resigned Apr. 29, 1988; John D. Saxon appointed as Special Counsel on Feb. 1, 1988 and resigned May 31, 1988; Pamela G. Powell resigned Sept. 5, 1988; Jeffrey H. Smith appointed as General Counsel Jan. 6, 1987 and resigned Sept. 5, 1988; Barbara B. Brown resigned Sept. 30, 1988; Carl M. Smith appointed Staff Director for the Minority, Jan. 6, 1987, resigned Dec. 12, 1988; Gerald Kent Bankus appointed Professional Staff Member, Feb. 18, 1987, resigned Dec. 31, 1988.

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE RULES OF PROCEDURE

(Adopted February 24, 1987)

1. *Regular Meeting Day and Time.* The regular meeting day of the committee shall be each Thursday at 10:00 a.m., unless the committee or the chairman directs otherwise.

2. *Additional Meetings.* The chairman may call such additional meetings as he deems necessary.

3. *Special Meetings.* Special meetings of the committee may be called by a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with paragraph 3 of Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

4. *Open Meetings.* Each meeting of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee or a subcommittee thereof on the same subject for a period of no more than fourteen (14) calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated below in clauses (a) through (f) would require the meeting to be closed, followed immediately by a record vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee or subcommittee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(a) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(b) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure;

(c) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of the privacy of an individual;

(d) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interests of effective law enforcement;

(e) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial

or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(f) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under other provisions of law or Government regulations.

5. *Presiding Officer.* The chairman shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the committee except that in his absence the ranking majority member present at the meeting or hearing shall preside unless by majority vote the committee provides otherwise.

6. *Quorum.* (a) A majority of the members of the committee are required to be actually present to report a matter or measure from the committee.

(b) Except as provided in subsections (a) and (c), and other than for the conduct of hearings, seven members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of such business as may be considered by the committee.

(c) Three members of the committee, one of whom shall be a member of the minority party, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, unless otherwise ordered by a majority of the full committee.

(d) Proxy votes may not be considered for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

7. *Proxy Voting.* Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. The vote by proxy of any member of the committee may be counted for the purpose of reporting any measure or matter to the Senate if the absent member casting such vote has been informed of the matter on which he is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that he be so recorded.

8. *Announcement of Votes.* The results of all rollcall votes taken in any meeting of the committee on any measure, or amendment thereto, shall be announced in the committee report, unless previously announced by the committee. The announcement shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and votes cast in opposition to each such measure and amendment by each member of the committee who was present at such meeting. The chairman may hold open a rollcall vote on any measure or matter which is before the committee until no later than midnight of the day on which the committee votes on such measure or matter.

9. *Subpoenas.* Subpoenas for attendance of witnesses and for the production of memoranda, documents, records, and the like may be issued by the chairman or any other member designated by him, but only when authorized by a majority of the members of the committee. The subpoena shall briefly state the matter to which the witness is expected to testify or the documents to be produced.

10. *Hearings.* (a) Public notice shall be given of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing to be held by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, at least 1 week in advance of such hearing, unless the committee or subcommittee determines that good cause exists for beginning such hearings at an earlier time.

(b) Hearings may be initiated only by the specified authorization of the committee or subcommittee.

(c) Hearings shall be held only in the District of Columbia unless specifically authorized to be held elsewhere by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee conducting such hearings.

(d) Witnesses appearing before the committee shall file with the clerk of the committee a written statement of his proposed testimony at least 24 hours not including weekends or holidays prior to a hearing at which he is to appear unless the chairman and the ranking minority member determines that there is good cause for the failure of the witness to file such a statement.

(e) Confidential testimony taken or confidential material presented in a closed hearing of the committee or subcommittee or any report of the proceedings of such hearing shall not be made public in whole or in part or by way of summary unless authorized by a majority vote of the committee or subcommittee.

(f) Any witness summoned to give testimony or evidence at a public or closed hearing of the committee or subcommittee may be accompanied by counsel of his own choosing who shall be permitted at all times during such hearing to advise such witness of his legal rights.

(g) Witnesses providing unsworn testimony to the committee may be given a transcript of such testimony for the purpose of making minor grammatical corrections. Such witnesses will not, however, be permitted to alter the substance of their testimony. Any question involving such corrections shall be decided by the chairman.

11. *Nominations.* Unless otherwise ordered by the committee, nominations referred to the committee shall be held for at lest seven (7) days before being voted on by the committee. Each member of the committee shall be furnished a copy of all nominations referred to the committee.

12. *Real Property Transactions.* Each member of the committee shall be furnished with a copy of the proposals of the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, submitted pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2662 and with a copy of the proposals of the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. App. 2285, regarding the proposed acquisition or disposition of property of an estimated price or rental of more than $50,000. Any member of the committee objecting to or requesting information on a proposed acquisition or disposal shall communicate his objections or request to the chairman of the committee within thirty (30) days from the date of submission.

13. *Legislative Calendar.* (a) The clerk of the committee shall keep a printed calendar for the information of each committee member showing the bills introduced and referred to the committee and the status of such bills. Such calendar shall be revised from time to time to show pertinent changes in such bills, the current status thereof, and new bills introduced and referred to the committee. A copy of each new revision shall be furnished to each member of the committee.

(b) Unless otherwise ordered, measures referred to the committee shall be referred by the clerk of the committee to the appropriate department or agency of the Government for reports thereon.

14. Except as otherwise specified herein, the Standing Rules of the Senate shall govern the actions of the committee. Each subcom-

mittee of the committee is part of the committee, and is therefore subject to the committee's rules so far as applicable.

15. *Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.* Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the full committee on all matters referred to it. Subcommittee chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their respective subcommittees after consultation with the chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of full committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings whenever possible.

PUBLICATIONS

Hearings

Department of Defense Authorization for Appropriations for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989. Hearings on S. 1174:

Part 1: U.S. Military Posture and Budget Overview. February 3, 4, 5, 17, 19, 1987; pages 1–359.

Part 2: Readiness, Sustainability and Support. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability and Support.) March 4, 5, 11, 17, 25, 1987; pages 361–718.

Part 3: Manpower and Personnel. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel.) March 3, 10, 18, 24, 31, 1987; pages 719–1682.

Part 4: Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) February 23, 26; March 6, 12, 19, 23, 24, 26, 31; April 1, 2, 9, 1987; pages 1683–2655.

Part 5: Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense and Defense Industry and Technology. (Joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense and Defense Industry and Technology.) March 17; April 2, 8, 1987; pages 2657–2810.

Part 6: Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense and Projection Forces and Regional Defense. (Joint hearings before the Subcommittees on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense and Projection Forces and Regional Defense.) March 12, 24, 26; April 7, 1987; pages 2811–3156.

Part 7: Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense, Defense Industry and Technology, Projection Forces and Regional Defense. (Hearings before the Subcommittees on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense, Defense Industry and Technology, and Projection Forces and Regional Defense.) March 9, 11, 16, 18, 25, 31; April 1, 9, 1987; pages 3157–3704.

National Security Strategy. January 12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 27, 28; February 3, 23; March 25, 30; April 3, 1987; 1112 pages.

Need for and Operation of a Strategic Defense Initiative Institute. (Joint hearing before the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management of the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence of the Committee on Armed Services.) May 6, 1987; 229 pages.

U.S. Military Forces to Protect "Re-Flagged" Kuwaiti Oil Tankers. June 5, 11, 16, 1987; 120 pages.

Manufacturing Capabilities of Key Second-Tier Defense Industries. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology.) July 23, 1987; 47 pages.

Alliance and Defense Capabilities in Europe. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense.) August 4; October 7, 20; November 3, 17, 1987; 388 pages.

Oversight Legislation Establishing the Position of Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition. September 22, 1987; 561 pages.

Air Force Space Launch Policy and Plans. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) October 6, 1987; 50 pages.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel.) October 9, 1987; 131 pages.

Safety Oversight for Department of Energy Nuclear Facilities. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) October 22, 26, 27, 30; November 3, 1987; 324 pages.

Department of Energy's Nuclear Weapons Laboratories. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology.) November 7, 1987; 120 pages.

Department of Defense Authorization for Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1989. Hearings on S. 2355:

Part 1: U.S. Military Posture and Budget Overview. February 18; March 14, 15, 16, 17; April 11, 1988; 858 pages.

Part 2: Readiness, Sustainability, and Support. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Readiness, Sustainability, and Support.) March 23, 25, 28, 31; April 13, 1988. Joint Hearing: Readiness, Sustainability, and Support and Manpower and Personnel. (Joint hearing between the Subcommittees on Readiness, Sustainability, and Support and Manpower and Personnel.) April 13, 1988; 517 pages.

Part 3: Projection Forces and Regional Defense. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Projection Forces and Regional Defense.) March 23; April 12, 14, 1988; 199 pages.

Part 4: Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Conventional Forces and Alliance Defense.) March 21; April 13, 14, 1988; 188 pages.

Part 5: Manpower and Personnel. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel.) March 17, 24, 29, 1988; 621 pages.

Part 6: Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) February 29; March 1, 18, 22, 25, 31; April 12, 15, 18, 1988; 730 pages.

Part 7: Defense Industry and Technology. (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology.) March 18, 29, 30; April 13, 14, 1988; 755 pages.

NATO Defense and the INF Treaty:

Part 1: January 25, 26, 27, 1988; 314 pages.

Part 2: January 29; February 1, 2, 1988; 247 pages.

Part 3: February 3, 4, 16, 1988; 284 pages.

Part 4: February 17, 18, 22, 23, 1988; 490 pages.

Part 5: February 24, 25; March 18, 24; April 14, 1988; — pages.

Reactors at the Savannah River Plant. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) February 29, 1988; 52 pages.

DOD Officer Promotion Procedures. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel.) March 3, 1988; 60 pages.

Role of the Department of Defense in Drug Interdiction. (Joint hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S.

Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.) June 15, 1988; 356 pages.

Defense Acquisition Process. July 11, 12, 27; August 4, 1988; 251 pages.

General Flag Officer Requirements. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Manpower and Personnel.) August 10, 1988; 59 pages.

Investigation into the Downing of an Iranian Airliner by the U.S.S. *Vincennes*. September 8, 1988; 56 pages.

Department of Defense Acquisition Policy Initiatives. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Defense Industry and Technology.) September 28, 1988; 67 pages.

B–1B Defensive Avionics System. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) October 4, 1988; 42 pages.

New Production Reactor Acquisition Strategy. (Hearing before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces and Nuclear Deterrence.) October 5, 1988; 120 pages.

Restructuring of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) Program. (Joint hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.) October 6, 1988; 86 pages.

Confirmation Procedures and Other Committee-Related Business. November 29, 1988; 16 pages.

Nominations: 100th Congress

Nominations before the Senate Armed Services Committee, First Session, 100th Congress, January 28; February 25; April 6; May 20; June 10, 24; August 4; September 29; October 9, 14, 16; November 12, 19, 24; December 1, 10, 11, 15, 18, 1987; 621 pages.

Robert T. Herres (January 28); Robert B. Costello (February 25); James H. Webb (April 6); John R. Galvin (May 20); Carl E. Vuono (June 10); Alfred Gray, Jr. (June 24); H. Lawrence Garrett III (August 4); Adm. William J. Crowe, Jr. (September 29); John J. Welch, Jr. (October 9); Kathleen A. Buck (October 9); June Gibbs Brown (October 14); Stephen M. Duncan (October 16); Frank C. Carlucci (November 12); Robert B. Costello (November 19); Samuel Kenric Lessey, Jr. (November 24); Robert W. Page, Sr. (December 1); Kenneth P. Bergquist (December 10); Robert C. Duncan (December 11); Lt. Gen. Colin Powell (December 15); Thomas F. Faught (December 18)

Nominations before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Second Session, 100th Congress. January 28; February 1; March 3, 21; May 13, 27; June 24; September 14, 23; October 4, 11, 12, 1988; 336 pages.

Grant S. Green (January 28); J. Daniel Howard (January 28); Ronald F. Lehman II (February 1); Jack Katzen (March 3); William Lockhart Ball III (March 21); Gordon A. Smith (May 13); Michael P.W. Stone (May 13); Kenneth P. Bergquist (May 27); David S.C. Chu (June 24); Charles S. Whitehouse (June 24); Milton L. Lohr (September 14); Ken Kramer (September 23); Clyde O. Glaister (October 4); Karen R. Keesling (October 11); George L. Monahan, Jr. (October 12)

REPORTS

100–17 Report of the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services, 99th Congress, March 19, 1987; 119 pages.

100–57 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989, 100th Congress, First Session, May 8, 1987; 228 pages.

100–117 Authorizing Appropriations for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 for Intelligence Activities of the U.S. Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System (CIARDS), and for other purposes, November 20, 1987; 5 pages.

100–232 Nuclear Protections and Safety Act of 1987, November 20, 1987; 43 pages.

100–312 NATO Defense and the INF Treaty, April 1, 1988; 137 pages.

100–326 National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989, May 4, 1988; 194 pages.

100–335 Authorizing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1989 for Military Activities of the Department of Defense, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–336 Authorizing Certain Construction at Military Installations for the Fiscal Year 1989, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–337 Authorizing Appropriations for the Department of Energy National Security Programs for the Fiscal Year 1989 and Authorizing Acquisitions for the National Defense Stockpile, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–338 Authorizing Appropriations for Civil Defense Programs for the Fiscal Year 1989, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–339 Supplemental Authorization for Fiscal Year 1989 for the Department of Defense, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–340 Providing Enhanced Authority to the Department of Defense to Transfer Funds for Fiscal Year 1989, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–341 Prohibiting Obligation of Funds Appropriated to the Department of Defense Which Are Not Authorized, May 12, 1988; 1 page.

100–404 Authorizing Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1989 for the Intelligence Activities of the United States Government, the Intelligence Community Staff, for the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, June 28, 1988; 4 pages.

EXECUTIVE REPORT

100–3 Consideration of the Nomination of Ten Brigadier Generals of the Marine Corps for Promotion to the Permanent Grade of Major General, July 24, 1988; 17 pages.

Committee Prints

100–38 Persian Gulf, June 17, 1987; 36 pages.
100–94 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the Conventional Balance in Europe, February 3, 1988; 55 pages.

INFORMATION RE APPOINTMENT OF BOARDS OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY, NAVAL AND AIR FORCE ACADEMIES

Public Law 816 of the 80th Congress provides a uniform procedure for the appointment of members of the Boards of Visitors of the Military and Naval Academies, and provides that there shall be appointed on or before the last day of every year Boards of Visitors to each of the Academies to be constituted as follows:

Senate:

Chairman of the Armed Services Committee or his designee.
* 1 Senator.
* 2 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee.
* (*To be appointed by the Vice President*)

House:

Chairman of the Armed Services Committee or his designee.
** 2 Congressmen.
** 2 members of the House Appropriations Committee.
** (*To be appointed by the Speaker of the House*)

Presidential:

Six persons, to serve for a 3-year term, 2 new members appointed each year. Each Board to visit respective Academy once annually.

Boards of Visitors to the

Military Academy: (Title 10, U.S.C., sec. 4355(q).)

1987.—Levin (Armed Services), D'Amato (Appropriations), Nickles (Appropriations), Shelby (at large).

1988.—Shelby (Armed Services), D'Amato (Appropriations), Nickles (Appropriations), Moynihan (at large).

Naval Academy: (Title 10, U.S.C., sec. 6968(a).)

1987.—Gramm (Armed Services), Mikulski (Appropriations), Hatfield (Appropriations), Sarbanes (at large).

1988.—Gramm (Armed Services), Mikulski (Appropriations), Hatfield (Appropriations), Sarbanes (at large).

Air Force Academy: (Title 10, U.S.C., sec. 9355(a).)

1987.—Wirth (Armed Services), Reid (Appropriations), Cochran (Appropriations), Pressler (at large).

1988.—Wirth (Armed Services), Reid (Appropriations), Cochran (Appropriations), Pressler (at large).

95-994 (56)